



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

learn, was mainly the work of R. M. T. Hunter (p. 524). The letters of Calhoun's supporters abound in striking comment on current politics and leaders and admirably supplement his own in the presentation of the aims and ideals of which he was the champion.

Professor Jameson has performed his task as editor, as was to be expected, in the spirit of broad historical scholarship and with a fullness of knowledge that make one regret at times the modest parsimony of illustrative or explanatory comment. In only one case was a probable error detected where on p. 599, Calhoun's remark, July 2, 1844: "I see Brownson's *Quarterly* has a short, but very good article on the subject," is annotated by "'The Texas Question,' *Democratic Review*, April 1844, p. 423." The note should have been, I feel sure: "Brownson's *Quarterly Review*, July, 1844, pp. 402-407." Brownson severed his connection with the *Democratic Review* at the time he established his *Quarterly*, January, 1844.

Professor Jameson takes leave of his labors with the remark that "his modest task has been to provide materials with which others may elaborate the fabric of American political history or the biography of Calhoun." A new biography of Calhoun is a great desideratum and one rises from the study of this volume and especially from the editor's introduction with the conviction that Professor Jameson is preëminently the man to write it. He has made the subject his own and he possesses in a high degree the qualities of mind to do justice to all sides and to lift his subject out of the realm of controversy.

EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE.

American Diplomatic Questions. By JOHN B. HENDERSON, JR.
(New York: The Macmillan Company. 1901. Pp. 529.)

THIS volume is made up of five separate papers: "The Fur Seals and the Bering Sea Award," "The Interoceanic Canal Problem," "The United States and Samoa," "The Monroe Doctrine," and "The North-east Coast Fisheries."

The first paper is mainly a résumé of the historical and legal points advanced by the United States and Great Britain before the Paris tribunal of arbitration in 1893. While strongly deploring the conditions that seem to threaten the destruction of the seal herd and condemning the selfish policy of the British Government in this connection, Mr. Henderson concludes that our case was not only without foundation in public law but contrary to principles we had earnestly striven to establish in other connections. He thinks that our contention before the Paris tribunal cannot be regarded otherwise than as an assertion of the doctrine of *mare clausum*.

The second paper deals with "The Interoceanic Canal Problem." After a somewhat detailed history of the various concessions, particularly that of the Maritime Canal Company, the writer proceeds to the discussion of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Mr. Clayton, he thinks, was unduly hurried

into the negotiation of this treaty by the aggressive attitude of England in the Tigre Island incident. It is not so much the objects of the treaty as the failure of Mr. Clayton to accomplish those objects, that Mr. Henderson criticises. On grounds of public policy and expediency he advocates a neutralized canal in the full legal sense of that term and not in the restricted sense given to it by Mr. Blaine. It is interesting to note that Mr. Henderson questions the commercial value of an isthmian canal.

In the paper on "The United States and Samoa" the author draws some very wholesome lessons as to the futility and danger of "entangling alliances." This perplexing question has at length reached a satisfactory solution through the withdrawal of England and the establishment of separate spheres of influence for the United States and Germany. In view of these facts 81 pages appear to be too much space to devote to what may be regarded henceforth as a closed question. As the writer himself says, "In the world's history the story of Samoa can never expect to find a more prominent place than a footnote. In the annals of diplomacy it must figure as a farce."

The fourth paper, on "The Monroe Doctrine," fills 160 pages. This is perhaps the least valuable part of the book, as the facts cited are for the most part well known and the personal opinions of the writer are open to criticism at many points. Mr. Henderson is not an advocate of the Monroe doctrine, which he characterizes in language more rhetorical than discriminating as the *ignis fatuus* of American politics. He seems to deny the power of development or growth in a principle of public policy and judges all appeals to the Monroe doctrine by reference to the original thought and intent of its author. The course pursued by the United States in regard to French intervention in Mexico he regards as in line with President Monroe's declaration but maintains that the action of Mr. Seward was in no way connected with the Monroe doctrine as such, and that the ground of his opposition to Napoleon III. would have been equally strong in the absence of any such specific and permanent embodiment of policy. "In the French invasion of Mexico," he says, "the threatened danger to the United States was so real and apparent that no juggling with magical words was necessary to satisfy the national conscience that interposition was necessary; and it will be noted that in all the official despatches relating to this international episode, no mention whatever is made of the Monroe Doctrine, no statement refers to a 'well established policy,' no precedent is exhibited, and no offerings are made upon the altar of a 'manifest destiny.'" So far as I am aware, Mr. Henderson will not find the Monroe doctrine referred to by name in any official despatch prior to Mr. Olney's Venezuelan letter of July 20, 1895. That Mr. Seward had the Monroe doctrine in mind cannot be doubted, for several of his despatches in this connection, even those from which Mr. Henderson quotes a few pages later, use language almost identical with President Monroe's message.

The fifth and concluding paper deals with "The Northeast Coast Fisheries." Mr. Henderson's views are in no way biased by the attitude

that his own government has assumed with reference to these matters. He points out that our alleged rights of participation in the inshore fisheries of Canada are wholly incompatible with our contentions for exclusive privileges in Bering Sea.

There are a few minor inaccuracies in the volume which may be typographical, but one is surprised to see it stated, on page 312, that the Greek insurrection of 1821 was crushed by the allied powers of Europe, and on page 314 that Canning succeeded Castlereagh as Prime Minister. It is difficult to know just what place to assign this volume in the literature of the subject. For the general reader it is too detailed, from the list of reference books it is debarred by the lack of an index, while the entire absence of footnotes or references of any kind to authorities will render it of little value to the student.

JOHN HOLLADAY LATANÉ.

Civil History of the Government of the Confederate States with some Personal Reminiscences. By J. L. M. CURRY, LL.D. (Richmond, Virginia : B. F. Johnson Publishing Company. 1901. Pp. 318.)

LIKE Dr. Curry's earlier sketch, called *The Southern States of the American Union considered in their Relation to the Constitution of the United States and to the resulting Union*, this counterpart of it is written in a lucid, candid, and persuasive style. Although the author was an Alabama Representative in Washington for four years before secession, and then divided the next four years between the Confederate Congress and the army, he feels neither bitterness nor personal regret. In most respects this volume is much like a record of a series of monologues by a well-read and thoughtful public man. Scholarly or thorough it does not pretend to be : in reality, it is a popular work in defense of secession, with a description of the excellencies of the Confederate Constitution and an outline of the political history of the Confederacy.

About one-third of the volume, called the "Legal Justification of the South in Secession," is essentially the substance of the familiar Calhoun argument with mollifying variations. Everywhere the question is assumed to have been one of principle and constitutional law ; nowhere does it appear that slavery was the cause of the strife or even a chief factor in the problem of getting a new government whose corner-stone should be slavery. On December 10, 1859, Dr. Curry made, in the House of Representatives, perhaps the most careful political speech of his life. In it he contemplated and advocated secession in case either Chase or Seward should be elected the following year, and yet he did not express a single word of complaint on any subject not directly concerned with the Southern interest in slavery. Remove the issue of slavery, and the South would have thought no more about secession than the Northwest did. Why this great difference in attitude then and now, common to perhaps ninety-nine per cent. of the surviving Confederate lead-